MINUTES FOR THE RECORD

Klamath Fishery Management Council
February 3, 1994
Mad River Saloon and Eatery Conference Room, Arcata, CA

ADMINISTRATION

9:00 am Convened. A quorum of members were present (attachment 1).

37. Review and approve agenda: The agenda (attachment 2) was revised based on overflow from yesterday's joint meeting.

Q: Could agenda item #47 regarding "possibilities for funding" be deferred?

A: Iverson: There are 2 grant sources for data collection on harvest monitoring issues: 1) The Klamath Fishery Restoration Program Request for Proposals (RFP) goes out the end of February and is due mid April, so this Council would need to consider proposals prior to the April meeting.

Lane: The Trinity County funding program is designed to do activities other than restoration work, but not much money is involved. The window to get proposals in is from April to Oct 1 for funding the following year.

*** Consensus on the revised agenda.

38. Approve minutes of the last meetings:

October minutes:
Revision: Masten: On page 7, strike the word "spring" from the fourth paragraph and
on page 11 add: "agreed to amend the plan with an errata sheet to change "court interpretation" to "the prevailing legal definition," under point 7.2 on the published long range plan.

** Motion: Adopt the October minutes as amended.
**** Consensus.

** Motion to approve March minutes.
**** Consensus.

** Motion to approve April minutes.
**** Consensus.

29. Mainstem spawning report, Shaw

Our office (Coastal California Fishery Resource Office) was funded to conduct mainstem spawning surveys on the Klamath River. We used a 14 foot inflatable boat to transport the crew down 20 mile sections of the river between Iron Gate Dam and Indian Creek. The crew, which consisted of a rower and observer, saw quite a bit of spawning habitat; estimated it to be 129,000 square meters, by using an average redd size of 7.5 sq meters. This can be considered habitat for 8,600 pairs of spawners in mainstem. 83 miles of river were surveyed. 87 redds (26% of total) were observed between Iron Gate Dam and Ash Creek (see attachment 3 for map). We noted that the majority of spawning occurred on the margins of the river channel. Lowering the flows in the river will de-water these redds. We measured how far redds were from the bank. We couldn't see into the water any deeper than 1.5 meters so we don't know if redds existed in water deeper than that. We are concerned about the effect that dredge mining is having on the redds and we noticed quite a bit of mining activity from Scott River downstream. The tailing piles are along the stream margins. No redds were observed in the tailings, but in some cases redds had been de-watered by dredge activities.

Q: Does your estimate of the number of redds in this section of the mainstem Klamath River include redds you couldn't see?

A: No, our estimate is only based on what we could see.

Q: Based on your survey, if you had to give recommendations on the amount of flow needed in the Klamath River, what would you say?

A: It is hard to make a recommendation for what the flows should be right now because we surveyed during the last week in October until the 3rd week in November. During that time, we observed redds in side channels and along margins of the river.

Q: Can you give us a rough percentage of the number of redds that would be de-watered by dropping the flow to 600 cfs?

A: We estimate that 26% of the redds above the Shasta River would probably be de-watered.

Q: If the natural spawning escapement in 1993 was 20,000 fish, why wasn't there a better utilization of gravel?

A: We estimated that 8,600 pairs of fall chinook could use the gravel available, but we only observed 330 redds. It seems like more chinook would choose to spawn in the mainstem, but we don't know why they didn't. The 20,000 fish returning to

spawn naturally were distributed throughout the Klamath River mainstem, Scott, Shasta and Salmon Rivers and various smaller tributaries.

Boydstun: CDFG surveyed the Klamath River mainstem in '78-'79 to define the areas with the greatest potential for spawning. Our conclusion was that there was a shortage of suitable gravel. That is to say, gravel was available, but it was of poor quality. We feel that there is a great potential for more spawning in the mainstem, but fish need a pick and a shovel to get through the sediment embedded gravel. The possibility of using mechanical methods to purge sediment out of the gravel below the dam might be considered.

Q: What about the possibility of redds existing in water deeper than 1.5 meters? Would snorkel surveys be utilized in the future?

A: Our survey is funded year by year. We hope to do more studies in the future and perhaps they could include directly observing redds by snorkeling.

Q: What agency permits dredging on the river?

A: California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) permits dredging.

Q: Mike Rode, is it possible that dredging could have a positive effect on the impacted gravel.

A: We are looking into that possibility. The Task Force will soon be looking at a proposal from CDFG for gravel augmentation below Iron Gate Dam.

39. Report on the 1993 fishing season (Barnes)

Barnes: The handout (attachment 4) shows the total landings and Klamath impacts of harvest during 1993. Note that the Ft Bragg cell (FTB) reflects sport landings because the commercial season did not open in that area.

Q: Given the fact that Klamath impacts were lower then projected in the Klamath Management Zone and adjoining cells, is the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) going to make a recommendation for how this should be used in the ocean harvest model?

A: I don't know the answer to that question. I do know that the time frame is really tight, but we will consider it if time allows.

Boydstun: The KOHM is based on a number of years and uses the average.

Boley: My point is that a base period is being used which does not accurately reflect what is going on over many of these cells. It seems only prudent to investigate other methods that might more accurately reflect the stocks.

30. 1994 ocean stock size estimate (Barnes)

Barnes handed out the 1994 Ocean Stock Size Estimates paper (attachment 5) and noted that, in the absence of ocean and river fisheries, the natural escapement would be 51,700 fall chinook. In Table 1 you can see that cohort data is incomplete for 3 yr olds. The wide disparity in the stock size of 1993 3 and 4 year olds leads to this year's corresponding disparity for 3 and 4 year olds. This year we adopted a strategy that does not rely on regression. In the past we used ocean 2 year olds to predict the stock abundance of ocean 3 year olds, but we've found that there are problems with the accuracy of this method at low abundances. Kope's concern about this inaccuracy prompted him to propose a new methodology that partitions the returns and makes separate estimates for different groups of fish. Specifically, the new Partitioned Cohort Methodology separates out: 1) Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) yearlings, 2) TRH fingerlings, 3) Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) yearlings, 4) IGH fingerlings, 5) other hatchery fish and 6) natural returns (Table 2). Average maturity rates for each stock component are calculated into the model.

Appendix B: There were 20,000 age 3 fish at Iron Gate Hatchery and 629 fish at Trinity River Hatchery. Age 4 fish returning to these hatcheries numbered only 709 and 111 respectively.

Kope: We used data from '78-'92 to come up with this model. Usually, 53.5% of the fish come back to the Trinity River, but last year 83% returned to the Klamath side.

Table 3 shows a lot of variability in maturity rates for age 3's. The stocks are skewed toward age 3 fish at Trinity River Hatchery. There are 3 sources for this variability: overwinter survival, year to year variability in maturity rates, and differences in stock composition. The Partitioned Cohort Method uses only the differences in stock composition to model stock abundance. The assumption is that overwinter survival is constant, and maturity rate for each stock component is averaged over the years of record.

Appendix A shows the results of hind casting. The second to the last column shows what happened when we used the Partitioned Cohort Method -- out of a total of 13 projections, 8 come out closer to the post season estimate and 4 come out farther away compared to the regression method. On average, for age 4 fish, the Partitioned Cohort method prediction comes out 90% of the post season abundance estimate while the preseason regression prediction is 150% of the postseason estimate.

Generally, the Partitioned Cohort Method is better at projecting stock abundance during low abundance years.

Q: Is the great variation in maturation rate from fish of different sources statistically significant? Is it consistent?

A: (Kope): Yes, the maturation rates are consistently different for fish from different sources. We don't know if it is statistically significant. IGH fish always have the lowest age 3 maturation rate, so maybe it is a genetic factor.

Q: When you hind cast for '87 and '88, did you use average maturity?

A: Yes, we used information that we would have had at that time.

Q: Last years jack returns were the best since '89, yet when I compare cohort performance I get mixed results... is the average maturity rate still used?

A: Yes.

Q: If we are to make harvest recommendations with the goal of restoring natural stocks, it appears that the cohort method will assist in more accurate projections that will ultimately help us to protect the stocks. Is this true?

A: Yes, the cohort method will assist us in prescribing more conservative estimates as opposed to the large errors that were associated with using the regression method.

Q: When this methodology is used, will we get lower projections?

A: Yes. Compared to the regression method, lower numbers of age 4's and higher age 3's are projected (primarily due to different maturation rates). The aggregate is a larger in- river run size, with a smaller number of natural fish. Barnes et al will meet with Robert Kope this afternoon to put this data together to forward to the Salmon Technical Team.

Barnes: In the past, the 4 year old forecast was a good tool, except at low abundances. This new method gives a more accurate forecast at low abundances. The TAT is not proposing that this method be used forever more. This is the best scientific estimate that we can give you this year, but there is no guarantee that it will be used next year or ever again.

Q: Will there be three separate methods for projecting ocean stock abundance at low, average, and high years?

A: We don't know at this time.

Q: Is this methodology leading to stricter harvest regulations, given that ocean fisheries have fallen below their predicted landings?

A: We don't know if this will mean leaner management options, because we haven't modeled it yet.

Q: Can we have clarification on the current definitions used for "natural" and "hatchery" fish?

A: "Natural" is any fish that doesn't go into the hatchery to spawn.

Hubbell: In the mid 80's hatchery managers followed different procedures than they do now. The current procedure is that fish not needed for broodstock are taken in, marked, then returned live and unspawned to the river. They are counted as hatchery fish.

"Hatchery" is any fish that spawns in the hatchery.

Q: We have expressed concern about the decline in the percent of the run that is considered natural fish, is this change in procedures and therefore counting methods contributing to this "decline in the number of natural fish?"

A: This year was the first year that Iron Gate Hatchery's ladder was kept open in order to capture and mark, as hatchery fish, the returning hatchery fish before letting them back into the river to spawn "naturally".

Q: If the database for forecasting is polluted by gate closures, hatchery:natural spawner definitions and counting procedural changes, how would we assess the inconsistency?

A: The only portion of the database that would be contaminated by this is the hatchery to natural split.

Boley: I'm in favor of the most accurate methodology that will fit in a given year. What would be the expected returns under the current policy? Is the expected ratio of 50% realistic? It seems to depend on the definition of natural and it looks to me like a policy issue.

Q: The cover page specifies that we can expect 52,000 natural spawners if no fishing occurs. If we are allowed to harvest, there are only 17,000 fall chinook available at a rate of 1/3 (compares to last year's rate of 33%). This would lead to 30,000 fish returning to the hatchery. What are we going to do about this?

A: Predicted hatchery escapement would depend in part on the allocation of allowable harvest. This hasn't been modeled

yet. A total harvest rate of 33% might be allowable, but it could be allocated in various ways.

Q: Does the new method use average proportion of natural spawners?

A: No, it is based only on data from last year, but we could use average of 73%.

Table 6 shows how many tagged Klamath fish were caught. From Weitchpec downstream the split between the Klamath and Trinity was 80:20.

Public comment

Jack Doyle, Brookings, OR. I used to be a commercial fisherman, I've also worked in the woods. In all due respect to Council members, the problem with the salmon fishery is obvious, people want to talk the fishery to death. I would rather see money spent for actual restoration projects to bring the fishery back instead of all these meetings with no on the ground work getting done. Young kids are already seeing the problems and what are we going to leave them? Zero? I want to see the restoration money put to better use.

John Crawford, President of Klamath Basin Water Users Association: I hesitate to muddy the water more, but I felt like everyone walked away with a hollow feeling after Mike Ryan's talk. I'm here to answer any questions about the Biological Opinion on the sucker. If it was felt that agriculture would also benefit from cutting back on the flows down the Klamath River, its untrue. Because of the drought, there are already 10,000 acres of land that will not get water this year. Another 60,000 acres may not get water since we are operating under the Biological Opinion for this listed species. We will have violated the opinion for the first 2 of the 3 years that the opinion has been in place. Wildlife refuges will also be affected by lack of flow. Irrigators are interested in doing whatever they can to help, but they will definitely be suffering. If there is such a thing as equitable suffering, then we will strive for it this year.

Q: What is the gross value of the agricultural products grown in the upper Klamath Basin?
A: I would estimate $200 million.

Walters: For the last 4-5 years, commercial and recreational fisheries in the KMZ have lost of money due to low fall chinook abundance. We have already paid for losses and we don't want to suffer any more.

Crawford: In 1993, the river flows were not impacted during the drought. At the recent water allocation meeting they said that

they prefer a more conservative operation plan. We should have lowered flows a bit last year so we wouldn't have to be impacting fishery as much right now. The reservoir (22k ac ft) needs an operational plan -- each year we use the total capacity. Water usage by farmers in the upper Klamath basin has stayed the same for the past 30 years (due to sprinklers etc).

Walters: Management of natural resources have changed a great deal since the 1930's, we need to go forward now with the resource we have now and we need to have a long range drought operation plan.

Elwood Miller, Klamath Tribe: I was concerned that when Mr Ryan got done speaking, he left us with the impression that all the water was being saved for sucker fish only. We all know that it is being saved for endangered species and for irrigation and for all the reasons that the lake has a dam on it in the first place. Our concern for anadromous species goes back in the lives of our people for a long, long time. Our spiritual connection to the fish has not gone away. The water situation is critical -- so is our concern for fish. We want to see parity in our needs and the State of Oregon's needs. We also need to pay attention to the inflow to the lake. We are trying to get adjudicated water rights for inflow to the lake. We are looking at ways to maintain the freshwater flow which plays into what is happening downstream.

Q: Do you mean that in order to reach a lake level of 4141 by March 1, the water users upstream were not required to modify their withdrawals?

A: Yes.

Dave Zepponi, Executive Director of the Water Users Protective Association: I was hired 7 months ago to do restoration activities. I represent 12,000 folks in the upper basin -- which is 20% of the total population. I want to comment on the lake level. The sucker is the reason the lake level is being held where it is. I feel that the slide program the Eureka High School students showed last night lacked sensitivity to what the water users feel are the issues. I recognize that through-the-eyes of children, we see what adults are thinking. I recommend that in the future, we have dialogue between upper and lower basin high school students. Children need to learn not to have biases against other people's actions. We are doing things to help the problems: 1) We have released the initial ecosystem restoration plan that emphasizes sucker recovery -- this is the first plan discussing the ecosystem approach and it was done because farmers wanted to work together. 2) Sprague River water quality improvement program (fencing and educational programs for cattlemen about how they can help and improve the system. Note: In many ways, I don't feel like I need to teach cattlemen anything because they are already conscious of stewardship methods. Meanwhile, they are suspicious of the federal governments actions because of what the Corps of

Engineers did years ago (e.g. draining wetlands). 3) In Modoc county 5 million acres were researched for water quality concerns. We found that the water quality was excellent so we fenced it off to protect it further. 4) Soon, we will be hiring a water quality consultant. We already have a fishery biologist hired. We thought we had made it clear that we wanted to be involved in water issues in the upper basin, yet we were disheartened when we found that the PFMC had written a letter to Secretary Brown and Babbitt. Why didn't we know about it ahead of time? We would like to know about these type of requests ahead of time in the future.

Boley: PFMC wrote those letters, not the KFMC. You are welcome to join in with PFMC activities. If you would like to be involved in the PFMC process, I would recommend that you: a) attend meetings of the PFMC, b) contact the PFMC's office in Portland, and c) consider serving on the habitat committee.

Q: What impact will groundwater wells have on flows in the upper basin?
A: I don't know of many wells being put in. Our association is primarily focussed on surface water.

<u>New agenda item: Support for Trinity Program's Reauthorization</u>

Chuck Lane, Trinity River Fishery Restoration Program: The legislation authorizing the Trinity Restoration Program ends September 30, 1995. The draft legislation for reauthorizing the Trinity Program is currently in the Department of Interior office. We would like to request a letter of support from this group for reauthorization. For your information, the Klamath Task Force chose a method of support that this group might emulate: a letter is being drafted by the subcommittee, then the Task Force will review the draft at their next meeting. The draft letter going through the Task Force will recognize the need for: 1) additional public involvement, 2) a possible change of membership and 3) integration of Klamath and Trinity restoration programs. The Klamath Task Force has asked us to come to their next meeting and give a report on current activities. I've handed out a background report (attachment xxx) on the Trinity River that deals with flows and mechanical manipulation of channel.

<u>Discussion</u>
- Trinity Program's membership needs to be modified to include commercial fishermen.
- Additional members should be added as appropriate.

** Action: This will be an action item on an upcoming agenda. Staff will prepare the draft that L.B. could edit.

- Staff should also research the appropriateness of this kind of comment from this body.

- Yesterday, we received a letter from Stokely which should be reviewed by this Council (Attachment xxx). The letter is being presented to you prior to following protocol on being signed by Patterson in order to fit this Council's timeframe. The letter shows the multitude of management considerations that aren't being followed. For example, Trinity Program restoration goals and objectives are not being followed. Restoration and harvest activities need to come together and coordinate more fully. I would like to urge this Council to exercise conservatism when reviewing the Technical Advisory Team's report. The megatable should include ocean impacts so we can see the total picture.

Lunch

Public comment

None.

Assignments to the Technical Advisory Team (TAT)

Discussion on possible assignments to the TAT:

- Forward analysis to STT for use in '94
- Further examine the issue of natural vs hatchery stocks (especially in respect to the definition of "hatchery" fish and the attributable proportion of the run).
- Include Karuk harvest in data computations. Then correct data for a more accurate ocean impact on Klamath stocks.
- Hindcast the zero intercept.
- Look at the long term use of various models at high, medium and low abundances (e.g. using different ones in years) to find the best management tool.
- Look into having the new partitioned cohort method used by the salmon team in '94.
- Show the results of the regression method side-by-side with the results of the partitioned cohort method.
- TAT's best estimate of ocean abundance by age.

** Assignment: The TAT will: a) resolve how to use '92-'93 data on the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model and b) look at the results of long term use of various models at high, medium and low abundance, c) show the new forecast side by side with old estimates, and d) run the linear regression model through the zero intercept. These assignments will be available for the Harvest Allocation Work Group to review by their next meeting (Feb 21).

Barnes: The forecast will be made by the Salmon Technical Team (STT) after it is out of the TAT's hands next week. Normally, what this Council does is give some assessment on alternative harvest rates.

Baracco: The STT is meeting during the week of February 18 to produce the Preseason Report #1 which will contain stock size projections for '94. This will be available March 1.

42. Report from Department of Commerce on the rule announcing the federally reserved fishing rights of the Yurok and Hoopa Valley Tribes (McInnis)

On Dec 23, 1993 we published a Federal Register Notice regarding the federally reserved fishing rights for managing Klamath stocks. Section 303 of the Magnuson Act states that the allowable ocean harvest must be consistent with all applicable law. This notice interprets the Solicitor's opinion as being acceptable to the Department of Commerce.

Bitts: The Department of Commerce makes rules and regulations pursuant to law, but this is only an attorney's opinion. This matter is under District Court review. We hope to have a decision prior to this year's fishing season.

Q: This announcement from Department of Commerce takes away the impetus for this Council to exist. What if the plaintiffs are ruled in favor of in this case?

A: I'm not in a position to comment. The Solicitor's opinion does not give us an exact number (other than 50%).

Q: Why is the Karuk Tribe absent from the Solicitor's opinion?

A: We'll need to check with the Solicitor to get the answer to that question.

*** Motion (Boydstun): This Council will forward a letter to the Department of Interior's Solicitor to clarify the opinion on Native American fishing rights (specifically in regard to fishing rights of Native American fishers -- other than Hoopa and Yurok Tribes in the Klamath watershed).

Seconded (Boley).

Discussion

- The Karuk Tribe harvest is only recognized by the State of California. Interior is the wrong entity to ask.
- My intent is to get this issue fleshed out. If it is possible to get this question answered at the next meeting, then I will be in favor of that.

***** Consensus.

*** Action: Staff will draft a letter for our review at our next meeting. We will comment and/or vote on the draft prior to it being sent to Interior (McIsaac).

43. Report from the Harvest Allocation Work Group (HAWG) (Wilkinson)

We met Nov 15-16 for a workshop. A proposal is on the table. We met again yesterday, more proposals are forthcoming. I hope the chair will entertain additions to my report from other committee members.

McCovey: I was asked at workshop to come up with ideas, we brought up new proposals, because the Oregon proposal was for allocation only. The Hoopa tribe still concerned about habitat, fishery issues and we are wondering where the forum for this concern is. We need to separate the court case from the Secretarial decision.

Boley: Proposals could be brought to either the HAWG or this Council.

Wilkinson: The HAWG is considering at least one more new proposal before we throw in the towel. We will meet on Feb 23-24 at the USFWS office in Arcata beginning at 9 am.

Bitts: This Council is charged with seeking the allocation to meet the needs of all fishing parties. The law that established this Council is still the applicable law; the Solicitor's opinion is not yet law.

Iverson: Remember that Section 460-ss2 of the Klamath Act assigns the Klamath Council to make recommendations to 5 specific management entities every year. There is an ongoing expectation from CDFG, BIA and the Hoopa Tribe for this Council to make those recommendations. If the directive of the law is not going to be followed, then this Council needs to make a conscious decision as to why not.

McIsaac: Hopefully, the Congressional mandate will be considered by the HAWG and this point will be considered at the subgroup level. I look forward to their report to us at the next meeting.

Orcutt: I'm also perplexed the tribal issues didn't get consideration at the HAWG meeting.

47. Council to discuss options for a process and schedule for identifying high priority data needs for harvest management (for which fy95 funding should be sought from Klamath or Trinity restoration programs).

** Action: Council members can make their own lists of funding needs and bring it to the next meeting.

** Action: KRFRO will send a copy of our request-for-proposals to the TAT (via Barnes). The TAT could then bring their proposals to the next meeting for review and approval. Perhaps the TAT would suggest funding requests for a better sport fishery creel census, and/or better recreational ocean fishing records. Staff will also bring a list of proposals already funded to the next meeting for Council review.

41. Spring chinook workgroup update (Polos)

I've asked for volunteers for this workgroup from the Trinity Technical Coordinating Committee, Trinity Task Force, Hoopa Tribe and CDFG. Mike Orcutt will be representing the Hoopa Tribe, Ralph Carpenter will represent CDFG and the others haven't gotten back to me yet. I understood that the Klamath Council was to provide me with a list of tasks, so until I get that we can't go forward.

McIsaac: We will postpone further action and assignments on this topic until next meeting.

44. Council comments on issues identified by four chairs (roundtable)

McIsaac: 5 issues were identified by the Four Chairs at the September 92 meeting: 1) education program, 2) endangered species, 3) South Fork Trinity, 4) escapement, and 5) defining success. Note that some of the topics of concern have been partially met. For example: we have agreed on a common goal statement.

Iverson: At the second Four Chair meeting in June '92, we added another action item to "improve information sharing" at the request of Anna Sparks.

Masten: At the October Council meeting, the chairs of the Klamath's two technical teams were planning to insure that information sharing was happening. Barnes and Rohde have been sending each other agendas and reports. Maybe we could ask Anna to forward us her minutes and we could send her both TWG and TAT notes.

Public comment

Jim Welter: In my opinion, a definition of "success" for this group would be -- forwarding a harvest recommendation to the PFMC in 1994.

Kent Bulfinch: I'm concerned about the trend we are experiencing of having larger returns of hatchery fish. If the drought continues, the hatchery outputs should be reduced.

Bob Rohde, Natural Resource Manager for the Karuk Tribe: I don't usually cover management issues, but since I was here for the discussion on harvest, I'd like to hear more discussion on the request to the Solicitor.

Boydstun: We are trying to get out in front of a potentially developing situation. I don't see any harm in asking for Interior's position on Karuk Tribe's fishing rights. It was informative to hear Leaf's report at the joint meeting on the number of fish involved in the tribal harvest.

George Kautksky, Hoopa Valley Tribe Fisheries Department:

1) The spawner deficit accounting proposal is being considered by the PFMC as a possible amendment item. Instead of scoping publicly for amendment 11, the PFMC will wait for the report from the over-fishing review group. The Hoopa Tribe is still considering spawner deficit accounting as a proposal for this year, especially due to this being the 4th year in a row that the Klamath is underescaped.

2) Regarding Scott Boley's comments on hatchery operation and the definition of hatchery vs natural spawner, if the gates to the hatchery were closed in '88 when the hatchery had all the fish it needed, we still would have failed to meet the natural spawning escapement floor.

3) The update on further communication and cooperation that Mike gave out (Attachment xxx) is a draft offer for closer coordination. It calls for rebuilding the stocks, and looking at potential for habitat.
xxx what handout is he referring to??

4) On March 23-24 at the Red Lion Inn in Eureka, the Klamath basin Symposium will provide a forum to review challenges to the restoration effort that tribes, state, and federal agencies are having with regard to the biological and physical challenges within the Klamath basin. Harvest and ecosystem management perspectives will also be shared. Mark your calendar.

50b. Adopt meeting schedule for 1994

March 1 and 2 -- Eureka: all day both days
March 7 and 8 -- Portland: evenings
April 4 and 5 -- Burlingame: evenings
Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Attachment 1

KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ATTENDEES

Klamath Fishery Management Council members present:

Dave Bitts	Calif. Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Scott Boley	Pacific Fishery Management Council
Virginia Bostwick	Klamath In-River Sport Fishery
L.B. Boydstun (for Al Petrovich)	Calif. Department of Fish and Game
Ron Iverson (for Lisle Reed)	U.S. Department of the Interior
Susan Masten	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Pliny McCovey	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council
Rod McInnis (for Gary Matlock)	National Marine Fisheries Service
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jim Walters	California Offshore Sport Fishery
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Attendees:

John "Chip" Bruss	Bureau of Reclamation
Barry Collins	Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game
Jim Craig	USFWS
Judy Cunningham	United Anglers KFMZ Coalition
Jack Doyle	KFMZ Coalition
Troy Fletcher	Yurok Fisheries
Leaf Hillman	Karuk Tribe
George Kautsky	Hoopa Fisheries
Todd Kepple	Herald & News
Paul Hubbell	Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game
Chuck Lane	USFWS
Michael Lau	Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game
Michael Maahs	Klamath River Technical Advisory Team
Rolf Mall	Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game
Tricia Parker	USFWS
Ronnie Pierce	Yurok Tribe
Michael Rode	Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game
Marshall Stanton	Tulelake Growers
Bev Wesemann	USFWS
Jim S. Welter	KFMZ Coalition
Desma Williams	BIA
John Wilson	Klamath River Technical Advisory Team
David Zepponi	Klamath Basin Water Users Protective Association

FINAL AGENDA
Klamath Fishery Management Council
3 February 1994

ADMINISTRATION

9:00 am Convene: introductions

9:05 37. Review and approve agenda

9:15 38. Approve minutes of the last meetings:
a) March, b) April and c) October 1993.

TECHNICAL REPORTS

9:30 29. Escapement goals and the underescapement report (Boley). [p14 KC notes]

39. Report on the 1993 fishing season (Barnes).

30. Discussion of CDFG's hatchery review report (issue resulting from the four chairs meeting)(Reynolds) [p14 KC notes].

40. Estimate of incidental take of salmon in whiting fishery (Barnes).
[Agenda item #6: from October meeting]

9:45 41. Report from the Technical Advisory Team regarding data on spring chinook that is relevant to shaping the fall chinook fishery (Barnes). [Agenda item #7: from October meeting]

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

10:00 42. Draft list of tasks to be addressed by the spring chinook workgroup and status of inviting representatives from the TTF and TWG (West and Polos).

10:15 43. Council comments on issues identified by four chairs (roundtable) (Agenda item #26 from October's meeting: Council to provide direction on issues identified by four chairs)

10:30 44. Report from the Harvest Allocation Work Group (Wilkinson)

10:45 45. Public comment.

KLAMATH COUNCIL FEBRUARY 3 (continued)

11:00 46. Action: Council recommendations on issues identified by four chairs.

11:30 47. Council to discuss options on a process and schedule for identifying high priority data needs for harvest management, for which fy95 funding should be sought from Klamath or Trinity restoration programs.

Noon 48. Future agenda items:

A) Harvest management/harvest estimate methods (all managers report)

B) Decide on making a recommendation to the PFMC -- if yes, then discuss options for 1994 meetings, reports, etc.

C) Decide on making other harvest management recommendations (CDFG: in-river sport, tribes: net harvest) -- if yes, then discuss options for 1994 meetings, and date for receiving harvest management reports, etc.

12:30 49. Public Comment

1:00 50. Action: a) Adopt process for identifying high priority data needs

b) adopt meeting schedule and agenda items for 1994.

1:30 Adjourn.

Attachment 3

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL HANDOUTS - February 3, 1994

Please circle any attachments you need and mail this sheet back to use in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope.

Agenda #29	Mainstem Klamath River Fall Chinook Spawning Survey - FY 1993, prepared by: Thomas A. Shaw, USFWS, Coastal Calif. Fishery Resource Office.
Agenda #30	Letter from Dr. Gary Matlock of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to Frank Warrens, Chairman, Pacific Fishery Management Council.
Agenda #31	Iron Gate Hatchery - Production Goals and Constraints, Mitigation Pacific Power and Light Company
Agenda #31	Results of a Review of Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Production in the Klamath River System - A Report to the Chairpersons of The Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, The Klamath Fishery Management Council, and the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Task Force
Agenda #37	Draft minutes from the joint Task Force -- Klamath Council Meeting of October 6, 1993.
Agenda #39	Ocean Stock Size Estimates and Appropriate Harvest Levels for Klamath River Fall Chinook, 1994 Season 1/, by Klamath River Technical Advisory Team (Corrected version), from Jerry Barnes
Agenda #39	1993 Sport and Commercial Harvest (Excluding Fall 1993) from Jerry Barnes
Agenda #42	Federal Register - Ocean Salmon Fisheries off the Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California
Agenda #46	Secretaries' Report - The Klamath River Task Force, The Trinity River Task Force, and The Klamath Fisheries Management Council
Agenda #48	Letter from the Technical Coordinating Committee to Roger Patterson of the Trinity River Task Force, regarding Recommendations from Technical Coordinating Committee on 1994 Klamath Fall Chinook